



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/336,031	06/18/1999	KEVIN CURTIS		7183
7590	05/26/2006		EXAMINER	
CHRISTOPHER R. GLEMBOCKI BANNER & WITCOFF 1001 G STREET N W SUITE 1100 WASHINGTON, DC 20001			COLBERT, ELLA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3624	
DATE MAILED: 05/26/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/336,031	CURTIS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ella Colbert	3624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 March 2006.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 12-15,30,33-36,39,40 and 43-49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 12-15,18-30,33-36,39,40 and 43-49 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/18/06</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 12-15, 18-30, 33-36, 39, 40, and 43-49 are pending. Claims 12-14, 20, 23, 25-28, and 39 have been amended in this communication filed 3/14/06 entered as Response After Non-Final Action and Request for Extension of Time.
2. The IDS filed 04/18/06 has been considered.
3. The change in Power of Attorney and Petition Decision Granted was entered on 4/24/06.
4. The correspondence address change filed 4/21/06 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
6. Claims 12 –15, 23, 25, 26, 39, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (US 6,122,635) Burakoff et al, hereafter Burakoff in view of (US 6,236,980 B1) Reese.

With respect to claim 12, Burakoff teaches, receiving, at a computer, an information element and at least an input symbol (col. 7, lines 5-15); normalizing the input symbol to generate a normalized symbol formatted according to a predetermined structure, the step of normalizing including applying one of a set of character rules and a set of process rules to the input symbol to generate the normalized symbol (col.3, lines 52-67); and storing at least the parent identifier and the information element so

that the parent identifier is linked to the information element (col. 4, lines 52-65). Burakoff did not teach, searching a master symbol database using a normalized symbol to find a matching master symbol and linked parent identifier; and wherein each master symbol is structured according to a symbol template containing at least one symbol field and wherein each master symbol includes at least one symbol segment corresponding respectively to the at least one symbol field defined by the symbol template. Reese discloses, searching a master symbol database using a normalized symbol to find a matching master symbol and linked parent identifier (col. 16, lines 20-34 and col. 17, lines 45-50); and wherein each master symbol is structured according to a symbol template containing at least one symbol field (col. 61, lines 10-26 and fig. 49); and wherein each master symbol includes at least one symbol segment corresponding respectively to the at least one symbol field defined by the symbol template (col. 13, lines 33-55). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to searching a master symbol database using a normalized symbol to find a matching master symbol and linked parent identifier; and wherein each master symbol is structured according to a symbol template containing at least one symbol field and wherein each master symbol includes at least one symbol segment corresponding respectively to the at least one symbol field defined by the symbol template and to combine Burakoff's processing the symbol and storing a parent identifier with Reese's normalized symbol and normalizing the input symbol formatted according to a predetermined structure and using the normalized symbol to search a master symbol database to find the matching master symbol because such a modification in Burakoff would allow a user to enter the ticker symbol with the parent ID being the association found within the database.

With respect to claim 13, Burakoff teaches, normalizing the input symbol to generate the normalized symbol includes the step applying a set of character rules to the input symbol (col. col. 7, lines 41-50). Burakoff did not teach the symbol is a normalized symbol. Reese teaches, a normalized symbol (col. 14, lines 22-34, col. 16, lines 20-34, and col. 17, lines 45-50). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a normalized symbol and to use the normalized symbol to find the matching master symbol and to combine Burakoff's processing the symbol and storing a parent identifier with Reese's normalized symbol because such a modification in Burakoff would allow a user to enter the ticker symbol with the parent ID being the association found within the database.

With respect to claim 14, Burakoff teaches, normalizing the input symbol to generate the normalized symbol includes the step of applying a set of process rules to the input symbol (col. 3, lines 2-13).

With respect to claim 15, Burakoff teaches, the at least one information element is a document (col. 3, lines 38-51).

With respect to claim 23, Burakoff did not teach, if the normalized symbol contains an unresolved segment, searching a contributor database to find a predominant use segment and assigning the predominant use segment to the unresolved segment. Reese discloses, if the normalized symbol contains an unresolved segment, searching a contributor database to find a predominant use segment and assigning the predominant use segment to the unresolved segment (col. 26, lines 14-24, fig. 10C(220) and col. 19, lines 3-17). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a normalized symbol contain an unresolved segment searching a contributor database to find a predominant use segment and to assign the predominant use segment to the

unresolved segment and to combine Burakoff's input symbol and parent identifier and Reese's relational database with Reese's normalized symbol containing an unresolved segment, searching a contributor database to find a predominant use segment and assigning the predominant use segment to the unresolved segment because such a modification in Burakoff would allow a user to enter the ticker symbol with the parent ID being the association found within the database and to search for another symbol/abbreviation in the database. This independent claim is rejected for the similar rationale as given above for claim 12.

With respect to claim 25, this independent claim is rejected for the similar rationale as given above for claims 12 and 23.

With respect to claim 26, this independent claim is rejected for the similar rationale as given above for claims 12 and 23.

With respect to claim 39, this independent claim is rejected for the similar rationale as above for claims 12, 23, 25, and 26.

With respect to claim 40, Reese teaches, if the input symbol contains at least one unresolved segment, for each unresolved symbol segment, the processor searches a client database to find a client preference segment, and assigns the client preference segment to the unresolved segment (col. 11, lines 13-39).

7. Claims 18-22, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (US 6,122,635) Burakoff et al, hereafter Burakoff in view of (US 6,236,980 B1) Reese and further in view of ((US 5,940,843) Zucknovich et al, hereafter Zucknovich.

With respect to claim 18, Burakoff teaches, each master symbol refers to a security issued by a company (col. 7, lines 35-40).

With respect to claim 19, Burakoff and Reese did not teach, the symbol template includes a root symbol field referring to the name of a security and a source symbol field referring to a country in which the security is traded. Zucknovich discloses, the symbol template includes a root symbol field referring to the name of a security and a source symbol field referring to a country in which the security is traded (col. 10, lines 33-65). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the symbol template include a root symbol field referring to the name of a security and a source symbol field referring to a country in which the security is traded and to combine Burakoff's process rules to the symbol and Reese's normalized symbol with Zucknovich's symbol template includes a root symbol field referring to the name of a security and a source symbol field referring to a country in which the security is traded because such a modification in Burakoff and Reese would allow Burakoff's and Reese's system to have a primary field for the name of the security and another field for the country. The root is known in the art as being the main or uppermost level in a hierarchically organized set of information. The root is known as the point from which subsets (in this case source symbol fields) branch in a logical sequence that moves from a broader focus to narrower perspectives.

With respect to claim 20, With respect to claim 9, Burakoff teaches, the step of storing at least the parent identifier and the one information element includes the steps of generating an information element identifier, storing the information element identifier and the parent identifier so that the parent identifier is linked to the information element identifier, and storing the information element and the information element identifier so that the information element identifier is linked to the information element (col. 3, lines 29-37 and lines 52-65, col. 4, lines 1-10, and col. 8, lines 43-47).

With respect to claim 21, Burakoff teaches, each symbol segment comprises an ASCII (American Standard Code for Information Interchange) string (col. 9, lines 30-40).

With respect to claim 22, Burakoff and Reese did not teach, the parent identifier is linked to the information element identifier in a relational database. Zucknovich discloses, the parent identifier is linked to the information element identifier in a relational database (col. 7, lines 5-15). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the parent identifier linked to the information element identifier in a relational database and to combine Burakoff's master symbol linked to the parent identifier and Reese's input symbol with Zucknovich's parent identifier linked to the information element identifier in a relational database because such a modification in Burakoff and Reese would allow Burakoff's and Reese's system to have a relational database that allows field searching. Relational databases are well known in the database art as being a database that stores information in tables - rows and columns of data - and conducts searches using data in specified columns of one table to find additional data in another table. In a relational database, the rows of a table represent records (collections of information about separate items) and the columns represent fields (particular attributes of a record).

With respect to claim 24, Burakoff and Zucknovich did not teach, if the normalized symbol is not found in the master symbol database, searching a database using the input symbol and retrieving a parent identifier linked to the input symbol. Reese discloses, if the normalized symbol is not found in the master symbol database, searching a database using the input symbol and retrieving a parent identifier linked to the input symbol in col. 14, lines 22-34, col. 16, lines 20-34, col. 17, lines 45-50, and col. 39, lines 23-42. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to have a normalized symbol not found in the master symbol database to search a database using the input symbol and retrieving a parent identifier linked to the input symbol and to combine Burakoff's input symbol and Zuchnovich's symbol field with Reese's normalized symbol not found in the master symbol database to search a database using the input symbol and retrieving a parent identifier linked to the input symbol because such a modification in Burakoff and Zucknovich would allow Burakoff's and Zucknovich's system to enter a ticker symbol (an input symbol) and to use the association found within the database to search for the parent identifier symbol.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (US 6,122,635) Burakoff et al, hereafter Burakoff in view of (US 6,236,980 B1) Reese.

With respect to claim 27, Burakoff teaches, normalizing the input symbol to generate the normalized symbol includes applying a set of character rules to the input symbol in col. col. 7, lines 41-50. Burakoff did not teach a normalized symbol. Reese discloses, a normalized symbol (col. 14, lines 22-34, col. 16, lines 20-34, and col. 17, lines 45-50). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a normalized symbol and to use the normalized symbol to find the matching master symbol and to combine Burakoff's processing the symbol and storing a parent identifier with Reese's normalized symbol and using the

normalized symbol to find the matching master symbol because such a modification in Burakoff would allow a user to enter the ticker symbol with the parent ID being the association found within the database.

With respect to claim 28, Burakoff teaches, normalizing the input symbol to generate the normalized symbol comprises applying a set of process rules to the input symbol (col. 3, lines 2-13). Burakoff did not teach a normalized symbol. Reese discloses, a normalized symbol (col. 14, lines 22-34, col. 16, lines 20-34, and col. 17, lines 45-50). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a normalized symbol and to use the normalized symbol to find the matching master symbol and to combine Burakoff's processing the symbol and storing a parent identifier with Reese's normalized symbol and using the normalized symbol to find the matching master symbol because such a modification in Burakoff would allow a user to enter the ticker symbol with the parent ID being the association found within the database.

With respect to claim 29, Burakoff teaches, the information element is a document (col. 1, lines 28-40).

10. Claims 30 and 33-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (US 6,122,635) Burakoff et al, hereafter Burakoff in view of (US 6,236,980 B1) Reese and further in view of ((US 5,940,843) Zucknovich et al, hereafter Zucknovich.

With respect to claim 30, Burakoff and Reese did not teach, each master symbol is structured according to a symbol template containing at least one symbol field. Zucknovich discloses, each master symbol is structured according to a symbol template containing at least one symbol field (col. 14, lines 23-66 and col. 15, lines 1-5). It would

have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have each master symbol structured according to a symbol template containing at least one symbol field and to combine Burakoff's processing a symbol with Zucknovich's each master symbol structured according to a symbol template containing at least one symbol field because such a modification in Burakoff would allow Burakoff to have preset templates for a user or a group of users from a particular company or geographic area and to have the template file opened for the characters to be inserted into the template. Templates are well known in the art for the purpose of being a predesigned document that contains formatting and in many cases, generic text.

With respect to claim 33, Burakoff teaches, each master symbol refers to a security issued by a company in col. 7, lines 35-40. Zucknovich teaches, each master symbol refers to a security issued by a company in col. 2, lines 55-61.

With respect to claim 34, Burakoff did not teach, the symbol template includes a root symbol field referring to the name of a security and a source symbol field referring to a country in which the security is traded. Zucknovich teaches, the symbol template includes a root symbol field referring to the name of a security and a source symbol field referring to a country in which the security is traded in col. 10, lines 33-65. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the symbol template include a root symbol field referring to the name of a security and a source symbol field referring to a country in which the security is traded and to combine Burakoff's process rules to the symbol with Zucknovich's the symbol template include a root symbol field referring to the name of a security and a source symbol field referring to a country in which the security is traded because such a modification in Burakoff would allow Burakoff 's system to have a primary field for the name of the security and another field for the country. The root is known in the art as

being the main or uppermost level in a hierarchically organized set of information. The root is known as the point from which subsets (in this case source symbol fields) branch in a logical sequence that moves from a broader focus to narrower perspectives.

With respect to claim 35, Burakoff teaches, each symbol segment comprises an ASCII (American Standard Code for Information Interchange) string in col. 9, lines 30-40. Zucknovich teaches, each symbol segment comprises an ASCII (American Standard Code for Information Interchange) string in col. 7, lines 16-25.

With respect to claim 36, Burakoff did not teach, the parent identifier is linked to the information element identifier in a relational database. Zucknovich teaches, the parent identifier is linked to the information element identifier in a relational database in col. 7, lines 5-15. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the parent identifier linked to the information element identifier in a relational database and to combine Burakoff's master symbol linked to the parent identifier with Zucknovich's parent identifier linked to the information element identifier in a relational database because such a modification in Burakoff would allow Burakoff 's system to have a relational database that allows field searching. Relational databases are well known in the database art as being a database that stores information in tables - rows and columns of data - and conducts searches using data in specified columns of one table to find additional data in another table. In a relational database, the rows of a table represent records (collections of information about separate items) and the columns represent fields (particular attributes of a record).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 43-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burakoff in view of (US 6,236,980) Reese.

With respect to claim 43, Burakoff teaches, receiving, at a computer, an information element and at least an input symbol (col. 7, lines 5-15); and storing at least the parent identifier and the information element so that the parent identifier is linked to the information element (col. 3, lines 29-30 and lines 39-45, col. 4, lines 15-19, and col. 10, lines 19-51). Burakoff did not teach, normalizing the input symbol, based on a historical pattern of a contributor of the information element, to generate a normalized symbol and searching a master symbol database using the normalized symbol to find a matching master symbol and linked parent identifier. Reese discloses, normalizing the input symbol, based on a historical pattern of a contributor of the information element, to generate a normalized symbol and searching a master symbol database using the normalized symbol to find a matching master symbol and linked parent identifier (col. 16, lines 20-34 and col. 17, lines 45-50). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to normalize the input based on a historical pattern of a contributor of the information element, to generate a normalized symbol and to search a master symbol database using the normalized symbol to find a matching master symbol and linked parent identifier and to combine Burakoff's receiving an information element, storing the parent identifier and the information element with Reese's normalizing the input symbol, based on a historical pattern of a contributor of the information element, to generate a normalized symbol and searching a master symbol database using the normalized symbol to find a matching

master symbol and linked parent identifier because such a modification would allow Burakoff to allow a user to enter the ticker symbol with the parent ID being the association found within the database.

With respect to claim 44, Burakoff teaches, receiving an input symbol (col. 7, lines 5-15) and storing at least the parent identifier and the information element so that the parent identifier is linked to the information element (col. 4, lines 52-65). Burakoff did not teach, normalizing the input symbol, based on a preference of a contributor of the information element, to generate a normalized symbol searching a master symbol database using the normalized symbol to find a matching master symbol and linked parent identifier. Reese discloses, normalizing the input symbol, based on a preference of a contributor of the information element, to generate a normalized symbol (col. 14, lines 22-34) and searching a master symbol database using the normalized symbol to find a matching master symbol and linked parent identifier (col. 16, lines 20-34 and col. 17, lines 45-50). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to normalize the input symbol, based on a preference of a contributor of the information element, to generate a normalized symbol searching a master symbol database using the normalized symbol to find a matching master symbol and linked parent identifier and to combine Burakoff's receiving an input symbol and storing a parent identifier with Reese's normalized input symbol, based on a preference of a contributor of the information element, to generate a normalized symbol searching a master symbol database using the normalized symbol to find a matching master symbol and linked parent identifier and to modify in Burakoff because such a modification would allow Burakoff to allow a user to enter the ticker symbol with the parent ID being the association found within the database.

With respect to claim 45, this independent claim is rejected for the similar rationale as for claim 43.

With respect to claim 46, this independent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claims 43 and 45.

With respect to claim 47, Burakoff teaches, receiving, at a computer, an input symbol (col. 7, lines 5-15); searching an information element database to find an information element linked with the parent identifier (col. 3, lines 29-30 and lines 39-45, col. 4, lines 15-19 , and col. 10, lines 19-51) and retrieving the information element linked to the parent identifier (col. 17, lines 45-50). Burakoff did not teach, normalizing the input symbol, based on an identification of a submitter of the input symbol, to generate a normalized symbol and searching a master symbol database using the normalized symbol to find a matching master symbol and a parent identifier linked to the master symbol. Reese discloses, normalizing the input symbol, based on an identification of a submitter of the input symbol, to generate a normalized symbol (col. 14, lines 22-34) and searching a master symbol database using the normalized symbol to find a matching master symbol and a parent identifier linked to the master symbol (col. 16, lines 20-34 and col. 17, lines 45-50). This independent claim is rejected for the similar rationale as given above for claim 45.

With respect to claim 48, this independent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given above for claims 45 and 47.

With respect to claim 49, this independent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given above for claims 47 and 48.

Response to Arguments

13. Applicants' arguments filed 03/14/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Issue no. 1: Applicants' argue: There is no teaching or suggestion at all in Reese to perform the step of normalizing as recited in independent claims 12 and 25 and there is no teaching or suggestion in Burakoff or Reese to perform the step of normalizing that includes applying one of a set of character rules and a set of process rules to the input symbol to generate the normalized symbol as recited in independent claims 12 and 25 has been considered but is not persuasive. Response: It is unclear from the claim language, Specification and the drawings what is meant by normalizing and a normalized symbol. Therefore it is interpreted that Reese teaches normalizing.

Issue no. 2: Applicants' argue: Applicants' respectfully submit that the cited prior art fails to teach the subject matter of claim 23, if the normalized symbol contains an unresolved segment, searching a contributor database to find a predominant use segment and assigning the predominant use segment to the unresolved segment, or the subject matter of claim 26 of determining whether the input symbol includes an unresolved segment and if the input symbol contains an unresolved segment searching a client database to find a client preference segment, and assigning the client preference segment to the unresolved segment has been considered but is not persuasive. Response: It is unclear to the Examiner what is meant by a normalized symbol and an unresolved segment. The claim language, Specification, and drawings do not offer much as far as understanding and clarification of these elements. Therefore, it is interpreted that Reese discloses these limitations as best as the Examiner can determine.

Issue no. 3: Applicants' argue: Burakoff and Reese failed to teach the subject matter of normalizing the input symbol to generate a normalized symbol and these

references fail to teach or suggest the subject matter of normalizing the input symbol based on a historical pattern of a contributor of the information element (claim 43), based on a preference of a contributor of the information element (claim 44), based on a historical pattern of a submitter of the input symbol (claim 45), based on an identification of a contributor or the information element (claim 46), based on an identification of a submitter of the input symbol (claim 47), or based on a preference of a submitter of the input symbol (claim 48) and Reese fails to teach or suggest the claimed subject matter of normalizing as recited in these claims has been considered but is not persuasive.

Response: The issue of normalizing and a normalized symbol has been discussed above in issue no. 2.

Issue no. 4: Applicants' argue: Claims 39 and 40 , the Office action fails to address these recited steps of receiving an input symbol, normalizing the input symbol, searching the symbol database and retrieving documents and the cited steps of 39 being performed by the processor has been considered but is not persuasive.

Response: This ground of rejection is considered moot in view of Applicants' amendments to the claims.

Conclusion: Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

The Examiner carefully drew up a correspondence of each of Applicants' claimed limitations, one or more referenced passages in Burakoff, Reese, and Zucknovich what is well known in the art and what is obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

The Examiner is entitled to give limitations their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the Specification (see below):

2111 Claim Interpretation; Broadest Reasonable Interpretation [R-1]

>CLAIMS MUST BE GIVEN THEIR BROADEST REASONABLE INTERPRETATION

During patent examination, the pending claims must be “given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification.” Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater, 162 USPQ 541,550-51 (CCPA 1969).<

Conclusion

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Inquiries

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ella Colbert whose telephone number is 571-272-6741. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Thursday, 6:30AM-4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent Millin can be reached on 571-272-6747. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

May 23, 2006



ELLA COLBERT
PRIMARY EXAMINER